

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the final Office action dated July 13, 2006 and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-24, 28, 30, 36, 39, 42, 43, and 44 have been amended by this Amendment C. Claims 1-3, and 5-45 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-3 and 5-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101(a) as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree. To further prosecution, however, claims 1-3 and 5-23 have been amended to recite a "computer-readable storage medium". Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-23 are in condition for allowance and the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Pub. 2002/0165960) in view of Hurvig et al. (U.S. Pub. 2004/0205243). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chan discloses an access tester for determining which entities have access to a resource (Chan, Abstract). In particular, a web server, an access server, and an administration server operate to delegate policy administration to the persons closest to specific business applications and content (Chan, paragraph [0097]).

Hurvig discloses a name server communicating with a plurality of directory servers (Hurvig, FIG. 2). Client devices send a query to the name server. Responsive to the query, the name server returns an Internet Protocol (IP) address of the host address of the identity server hosting a particular identity. The name server provides a "mapping from the name strings to the corresponding identity servers or sites." (Hurvig, Abstract). The client devices use the returned IP address to directly contact the identity server and communicate directly, exclusive of the name server, with the identity server to authenticate the client device (Hurvig, paragraphs [0195] through [0197]).

In contrast, aspects of the invention recite a plurality of administration servers communicating with an authentication server. Amended claim 1 recites "associating a plurality of namespaces with a plurality of administration servers, **wherein each of the namespaces is associated with one of the plurality of administration servers.**" For example, the domain A.com may be associated with one administration server while the B.com domain may be associated with another administration server. Amended claim 1 further recites the administration server being responsive to an administrator, where the **administration servers issue a request to the authentication server.** None of the cited references disclose or suggest the association of each of the plurality of namespaces with one of plurality of administration servers, let alone the issuance of a request from the administration servers to the authentication server.

The name server of Hurvig, responsive to the client devices, maps namespaces to identity servers. The name server in Hurvig performs domain name server (DNS) lookups and forwards the address of the appropriate identity server to the client devices, but the name server is not involved in subsequent communications between the client device and the identify server. The client device is then able to communicate directly with the appropriate identity server with the address of the identity server. This is completely different from the present invention as claimed in amended claim 1.

Neither Chan nor Hurvig, alone or in combination, disclose an administration server having the functionality claimed in amended claim 1. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 24, 36, and 39 recite similar features and thus Applicants submit that claims 24, 36, and 39 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is patentable. The rejected claims depending from claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 26, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Hurvig and further in view of Convent et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. 2002/0016814). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 22, 26, and 42 incorporate the limitations of amended claims 1, 24, and 39, respectively. The cited references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed features of claims 1, 24, and 39. As such,

claims 22, 26, and 42 are allowable over Chan in view of Hurvig and further in view of Convent for at least these reasons. As such, the rejection of claims 22, 26, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be removed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400